

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested. The following remarks are responsive to the Final Office Action mailed September 29, 2005.

Claim Objections

Claims 12-18 are objected as being a substantial duplicate of claims 3-9. However, the Examiner appears to not take into account that they are dependent from claims that are not substantially the same. Therefore, claims 12-18 when read to include the limitations of the independent claim are not substantially the same as claims 3-9. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the objection is not appropriate.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

Claims 4, 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, claim 3 claims a "machine-readable medium", whereas claims 4, 5-9 refer to the "method of claim 3". Applicant has amended claim 3 to refer to a method instead of a machine-readable medium.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claims are presently in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. 102 Rejections

Claims 1, 3-6, 10, 12-15, 19, 21, and 23-26 are rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Juffa (U.S. Patent No. 6,247,117). Specifically, independent

claims 1, 10, 19, and 25 are rejected as being anticipated by Juffa. Claims 1, 10, 19, and 25 claim, *inter alia*, that the memory image is generated by performing a save state operation (in claims 1, 10, and 19) and an instruction (in claim 25). Juffa, on the other hand, does not teach a memory image or mask storage area as claimed by applicant nor a memory image or mask storage area that is generated by the performance of a save state operation or any other operation or instruction, as claimed by Applicant in presently amended claims 1, 10, 19, and 25.

However, the Office Action characterizes the architectural flag register of Figure 6B as being a "memory image" to support the rejection. Assuming, for the sake of argument, that the architectural flag register of Juffa constitutes a "memory image" as claimed, then Juffa does not teach the memory image (architectural flag register) being generated by the performance of a save state operation or instruction. However, Applicant submits that Juffa not only fails to teach generating a memory image, but fails to teach a memory image (or other storage area) generated as a result of performing a save state operation or other instruction.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claim 1, 3-6, 10, 12-15, 19, 21, and 23-26 are presently in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections

Claims 8, 9, 17, 18, 22, and 27-29 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Juffa (U.S. Patent No. 6,247,117) in view of Temple (U.S. Patent No. 5,875,342). Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections are now moot in view of the above comments regarding independent claims 1, 10, 19, and 25. Accordingly,


Applicant submits that claims 8, 9, 17, 18, 22, and 27-29 are presently in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional fees due, please charge them to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: February 16, 2006



Michael J. Mallie
Reg. No. 36,591

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
(408) 720-8300